Project Name:	Adopt National Standards for Inpatient Discharge Data
OCIO Project #:	
Department:	OSHPD
Revision Date:	5/21/09

Concept Statement

Description

Brief description of the proposed project:

Migrate Inpatient Hospital Discharge Data elements, as reported via MIRCal, from OSHPD proprietary definitions to national standards. See statutory requirements for use of national standards, "as applicable," in the CA Health and Safety Code, Health Data and Advisory Council Consolidation Act, Section 128735. Health facilities are currently required to use national standards for reporting Emergency Department and Ambulatory Surgery data to the Patient Data Section (PDS) within the Healthcare Information Division (HID) of OSHPD. This would align definitions in all three programs. Regulation changes would be needed leading to MIRCal changes in validation rules, edit reports, correction aids, education & outreach materials, staff training, imports to the data warehouse, reference materials, and output products. HID operations in PDS, the Healthcare Outcomes Center, the Healthcare Information Resource Center, the Data Management Office, and support in ITSS would be significantly impacted. Full project management would be required. Some amount of work could be performed via external contracts, such as the revision to required file format specifications and validation programs.

Need Statement

High Level Capabilities Needed:

Change all IT and MIRCal system functions for revised data elements (approximately), coordination with regulation change process, contract management, and project management. Must accommodate MIRCal structure and functions, programming, validation, testing, security, application revision and maintenance, staff training, outreach, and align with other MIRCal projects and initiatives. Make modifications to data warehouse and corporate reports.

What is Driving This Need?

Differences exist between OSHPD proprietary definitions and national standards. Unnecessary burdens are placed on hospitals, emergency departments, ambulatory surgery centers, and all data users due to two sets of definitions for the same data elements in patient level data programs. No benefit is gained from retaining disconnected definitions in similar databases.

Risk to the Organization if This Work is Not Done:

OSHPD ignores difficulty of maintaining differing data and unnecessary burdens on data providers, thus ignoring statutory mandate to continuously evaluate and implement improvements in data collection programs.

Benefit Statement

Intangible Benefits

Process Improvements (describe the nature of the process improvement)

OSHPD will see improved data value in consistent definitions of data elements, greater ease in cross database comparisons and linkages, and improved aggregations.

Other Intangible Benefits:

OSHPD data will be improved, relevant, and synchronized internally as well as with national healthcare information.

Tangible Benefits

Revenue Generation (describe how revenue will be generated):	
None.	
Cost Savings (describe how cost will be reduced):	
None.	
<u> </u>	
	ļ

Cost Avoidance (describe the cost and how avoided):

If OSHPD retains these discrepancies in definitions, it prolongs unnecessary staff time spent on reconciliations.

OCIO Project #:	ational Standard	s for Inpatient Discharge Data		
Department: OSHPD				Concept Statem
Revision Date: 5/21/09				•
	•	· · ·		
Risk Avoidance (describe th				
OSHPD will avoid risk of no forcing comparisons.	oncomparability, a	a key factor in conducting high o	quality data collection and disclosure	e. This would reduce inaccuracies inher
Improved Services:				
Provide comparable and us	seful data.			
		Consis		
"No" Responses		Rai	tionale	Action Required
Enterprise Architecture	Yes			
Business Plan Strategic Plan	Yes Yes			
Strategic Fian	162			
		Impact to Oth	er Agencies	
of Impact to Other Age	encies		<u> </u>	
Agency:				
Describe the nature of the impact:				
Other state, governmental, effectiveness, and patient s		ies will have access to aligned o	latabases for uses that include heal	th care planning, epidemiology, healthca
Agency:				
Describe the nature of the impact:				
A				
Agency: Describe the nature of the impact:				
A				
Agency: Describe the nature of the impact:				
		Solution Al	ternatives	
			ernative 1:	
Do nothing = stay with disc	repant definitions	s. Ignore well-defined basics of o	data quality and good data manager	ment.
,		Technical Conside	erations for Alternative 1:	
ROM Cos			Note: high end of range m	

Revision Date: 5/21/09 Alternative 2: ED and AS data Revise elements to align with proprietary definitions, ignoring statutory mandate to follow national standards, as applicable. Technical Considerations for Alternative 2: MIRCal system and data warehouse changes would be required without gaining benefits from using standards. ROM Cost: to Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range Alternative 3: Conversion to national standards. Technical Considerations for Alternative 3:	OCIO Project #: Department: OSHPD		Concept Statement
ED and AS data Revise elements to align with proprietary definitions, ignoring statutory mandate to follow national standards, as applicable. Technical Considerations for Alternative 2: MIRCal system and data warehouse changes would be required without gaining benefits from using standards. ROM Cost: 10 Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range Alternative 3: Conversion to national standards. Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range \$1M - \$2M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range Recommendation Comparison: Rom Cost Risk 1 M 2 M Risk Alternative 2 Rom Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 M 2 M Risk Conclusions: 1 D 2 M Risk Conclusions:			<u>-</u>
Technical Considerations for Alternative 2: MiRCal system and data warehouse changes would be required without gaining benefits from using standards. ROM Cost: to Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range Alternative 3: Conversion to national standards. Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range S1M - 52M Recommendation Comparison: Alternative 1 ROM Cost: Risk Alternative 2 ROM Cost: Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost: Risk Conclusions: Risk Conclusions: Risk Conclusions: 1 M - 2 M Recommendation:		Alternative 2:	
MIRCal system and data warehouse changes would be required without gaining benefits from using standards. ROM Cost: 10 Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range Alternative 3: Conversion to national standards. Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range sim. s2M Recommendation Comparison: Alternative 1 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 2 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 M 2 M ROM Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 ROM Cost Risk Recommendation:	ED and AS data Revise elements to	align with proprietary definitions, ignoring statutory	mandate to follow national standards, as applicable.
MIRCal system and data warehouse changes would be required without gaining benefits from using standards. ROM Cost: 10 Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range Alternative 3: Conversion to national standards. Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range standards. Recommendation Comparison: Alternative 1 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 2 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 M 2 M ROM Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 Conclusions:			
ROM Cost: to Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range Alternative 3: Conversion to national standards. Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range S1M - \$2M Recommendation Comparison: Alternative 1 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 2 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 1 2 1 2 3 3 4 4 1		Technical Considerations for	Alternative 2:
Alternative 3: Conversion to national standards. Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range stime. StM - S2M Recommendation Comparison: Alternative 1 ROM Cost Risk S0 - \$0 SO	MIRCal system and data warehouse	changes would be required without gaining benefits	s from using standards.
Alternative 3: Conversion to national standards. Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range stime. StM - S2M Recommendation Comparison: Alternative 1 ROM Cost Risk S0 - \$0 SO			
Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range stim - \$2M	ROM Cost:	to	Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range
Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range stim - \$2M			
Technical Considerations for Alternative 3: Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION RISK RISK RISK RISK Alternative 2 ROM Cost Risk RISK Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 Conclusions: 1 ROM Cost Risk RISK RISK RISK RISK RISK ROM Cost Risk RIS	Conversion to national standards	Alternative 3:	
Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range S1M - S2M Recommendation Comparison: Alternative 1 ROM Cost Risk S0 - \$0 Alternative 2 ROM Cost Risk S0 - \$0 Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:	Conversion to national standards.		
Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range S1M - S2M Recommendation Comparison: Alternative 1 ROM Cost Risk S0 - \$0 Alternative 2 ROM Cost Risk S0 - \$0 Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 1 Conclusions: 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:			
Will require modification of a variety of OSHPD healthcare databases. ROM Cost: 1 M 2 M Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range S1M - S2M Recommendation Comparison: Alternative 1 ROM Cost Risk S0 - \$0 Alternative 2 ROM Cost Risk S0 - \$0 Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk Conclusions: 1 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:			
ROM Cost: 1 M	NA/III		Alternative 3:
Recommendation	will require modification of a variety of	of OSHPD nealthcare databases.	
Recommendation			
Recommendation	ROM Cost.	1 M 2 M	Note: high and of range must not exceed 200% of low and of range
Comparison: Alternative 1			tote. High ond of range must not exceed 200/80/10W and of range
Comparison: Alternative 1		Pecommendation	
Alternative 1		Recommendation	
Alternative 2 ROM Cost Risk \$0 - \$0 Alternative 3 ROM Cost Risk 1 M - 2 M Conclusions: 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:		ROM Cost	Risk
\$0 - \$0 ROM Cost Risk 1 M - 2 M Conclusions: 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:	Altornative 2		Diak
Conclusions: 1			RISK
Conclusions: 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:	Antimative 2	φυ - φυ	
1 2 3 4 Recommendation:		ROM Cost	Risk
2 3 4 Recommendation:		ROM Cost	Risk
3 4 Recommendation:	Alternative 3	ROM Cost	Risk
Recommendation:	Alternative 3 Conclusions:	ROM Cost	Risk
	Alternative 3 Conclusions:	ROM Cost	Risk
	Conclusions: 1 2 3	ROM Cost	Risk
	Conclusions: 1 2 3 4	ROM Cost	Risk
	Alternative 3 Conclusions: 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:	ROM Cost 1 M - 2 M	
	Alternative 3 Conclusions: 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:	ROM Cost 1 M - 2 M	
	Alternative 3 Conclusions: 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:	ROM Cost 1 M - 2 M	
	Alternative 3 Conclusions: 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:	ROM Cost 1 M - 2 M	
Project Approach (if known)	Alternative 3 Conclusions: 1 2 3 4 Recommendation:	th OSHPD's mandate to use national standards and	I to provide more consistent, maintainable and useable data.

System Complexity: System Business Hours: (e.g., 24x7, 9am-5pm):					:		
Architecture	☐ Mainframe	✓ Client Server			Num. of New Databases:		0
Technology	□ New	☐ New to Staff	✓ In-House Experience		Interfaces		
Implementation	☐ Central Site	☐ Phased Roll-out				Num. of Sites:	1
M & O Support	☐ Contractor	□ Data Center	☐ Project	✓ In House			
Procurement Approach: CMAS for temporary specialized consultant services. CSSI for all hardward and SA for software.					Number of Procur	ements:	
Open Procureme	nt? Yes	Delegated Procurement?	? Yes			1	

Project Name: Adopt National Standards for Inpatient Discharge Data